

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RAYMOND REECE,

Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF KENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-479

HON. JANE M. BECKERING

/

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This is a prisoner civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 12, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that Plaintiff's § 1983 claim be dismissed upon initial screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2), 1915A, for failure to state a claim; and Plaintiff's state-law gross negligence claim be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3). The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 11).

Plaintiff "objects to the proposition that § 1983 cannot be used to obtain information" that he seeks, and he points out that his "pleadings do not have the skills of a licensed attorney" (Pl. Obj., ECF No. 11 at PageID.13). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3), the Court has performed de novo consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. Plaintiff's argument fails to demonstrate any legal error in the Magistrate Judge's analysis or conclusion. While pleadings filed by pro se litigants are entitled to a more liberal reading than would be afforded to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers, such complaints still must plead a plausible claim for relief. *Davis*

v. Prison Health Services, 679 F.3d 433, 437–38 (6th Cir. 2012); *Stanley v. Vining*, 602 F.3d 767, 771 (6th Cir. 2010). The Court therefore denies the objections and adopts the Report and Recommendation.

A Judgment will also be entered consistent with this Memorandum Opinion and Order. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 58. For the above reasons and because this action was filed *in forma pauperis*, this Court also certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) and consistent with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation that an appeal of this Judgment would not be taken in good faith. *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 610–11 (6th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds by *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 206, 211–12 (2007). Accordingly:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Objections (ECF No. 11) are DENIED and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 10) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation, that Plaintiff’s § 1983 claim is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2), 1915A, for failure to state a claim.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation, that this Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s state-law gross negligence claim, which is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith.

Dated: June 30, 2025

/s/ Jane M. Beckering
JANE M. BECKERING
United States District Judge